
Comments on the Alliance

by Norm Olson, Commander,

Northern Michigan Regional Militia

I have read the Articles of Alliance and agree with the purpose and intent. Certainly there needs to be cooperation among the various militias. As you may know, my intent in forging the idea of a 3d Continental Congress was to bring together the militias under a national command authority, subordinate to the Congress of the Provisional Government. While the Alliance achieves the generally intended amalgamation of state militia groups, it still lacks oversight by a Congress or Committee of Safety. Without that oversight, difficulty may arise in carrying out the actions alluded to in the document.

For example:

We pledge that the unwarranted use of deadly force against any militiaman, within the Alliance, will be considered an act of war that will bring a swift response from all the Alliance militias.

While I would agree with the general idea, I am troubled that "unwarranted" is too ambiguous and will lead to real problems in deciding whether the act that resulted in the death of a militia member would in fact bring a swift response.

Some questions that would need to be decided fairly rapidly would be:

1. Under what circumstances would deadly force be warranted?
2. If there were a question as to whether the death was warranted, who would decide if a collective response would follow?
3. If debate over whether a death was warranted or unwarranted were to occur, how could a response be swift?

As one might imagine, any action that results in the death of one militia member may be considered to be "unwarranted" by someone.

Obviously, those who perpetrated the action might think it justified, while those who might claim that "any action by an illegal government" constitutes "unwarranted action." As you can see, the term is not only ambiguous, but the conditions leading to a response are already determined before the event takes place.

Declaring that we WILL take a prescribed action eliminates our control of the response and the options available to us. We are locked in to either doing what we say we will do or be shown to be "paper tigers" if we don't. Without a unified command structure, the Alliance will be strained at the first situation where a militia member is killed, regardless of how it happens.

Perhaps rather than lay it out in terms that can cause division, other words might be better and less controversial, giving us more options and remedies without losing credibility IF WE DON'T react. While I won't argue that each and every militia member is valuable, the chances of an individual doing something that gets him killed is far higher than the chances that a well-regulated group will do so.

Consider for a minute this idea:

The corporate response by an alliance ought to be balanced so that "an Federal attack against any Alliance Militia will be considered as an attack against the Alliance and may be responded to by the Alliance." This caveat would prevent a war starting because one individual happened to be killed by a Barney Fife Sheriff's Deputy somewhere... (it happens....accidents happen). But by clarifying that a Federal Government attack on an entire body of militia would be an act of aggression against the Alliance, there develops a self-policing among militia organizations to

prevent (as best they can) an act that might provoke a federal attack. This also provides our local police (sheriffs and troopers) some breathing room IF, repeat IF, some boneheaded goober shoots one of our people. As in the case of Mike Hill, we didn't know the facts for some time and still don't since there are two sides of the story, but if another tragedy such as the Mike Hill murder were to happen, would we activate the entire Alliance? What if member groups refused to cross state lines for the sake of one person's death due to a stupid accident where possibly both individuals (the victim and the shooter) were equal and simply drew and started shooting?

Now compare that scenario with a large group. It would seem that if 100 ATF or FBI go marching in against a militia organization that is trying to abide by lawful and just rules while enjoying their rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights, I think it would be safe to say that an Alliance Response would be in order.

And IF such a situation were to take place, the determination of the REASON for a collective retaliatory response would be clearer.

Think about it. This issue is brought up NOT to stir up trouble, but to look at "choke points" that could cause a falling out or dissension over what might be considered a reason for a response and by whom.

Since this is an Alliance of Militia Organizations rather than a agreement of militia individuals around the country, it ought to focus on the organizations and not make a statement of intent to retaliate or avenge the death of a single individual. The principle is that we ought not make a threat we cannot and will not follow through on; for to do so limits our options and puts us in the corner strategically. It is better to have UNITED retaliation AS AN

OPTION, but it may be unwise to declare that it will be done in response to what may be argued to be an "unwarranted" death of a single individual.

Alliance leaders need to emphasize responsible and wise behavior by member organizations so that a member group doesn't do something that will bring contention and conflict between other member militias.

I urge member militia units to work together to establish some kind of unified command structure of people able to foresee and plan in advance of contingencies, take responsibility and command/control authority DURING, and rational responsive action FOLLOWING any possible contingency situation.

Something to think about. .

.

Back to [Modern Militiaman #6](#)
Back to [The Patriot Coalition?](#)
Back to [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

.